

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)
United States Attorney

2 EUMI L. CHOI (WVSBN 0722)
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)
Assistant United States Attorney

5 150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900
6 San Jose, California 95113
7 Telephone: (408) 535-5056
8 FAX: (408) 535-5066
Susan.Knight@usdoj.gov

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 SAN JOSE DIVISION
13

14
15 *E-FILED - 1/25/06*
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
 2 Plaintiff,)
 3 v.)
 4 STEVEN ROLAND DOANE,)
 5 Defendant.)
 6)
 7)

No. CR 05-00515 RMW

ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
 FROM THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
 CALCULATION (18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A)
 & 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv))

8 On January 9, 2006, the undersigned parties appeared before the Court for a status
 9 hearing in the above-captioned case. Assistant United States Attorney Susan Knight explained to
 10 the Court that the parties are working on a disposition of case and that the defendant agreed to
 11 provide the government with additional documentation regarding his treatment. Therefore, the
 12 parties stipulated and agreed that an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from January
 13 9, 2006 to February 13, 2006 was appropriate in order for Assistant Federal Public Defender
 14 Angela Hansen to provide additional treatment records to the government in order to facilitate
 15 plea negotiations. The parties also stipulated and agreed that an exclusion under Speedy Trial
 16 Act was appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of counsel.

17 SO STIPULATED.

KEVIN V. RYAN
 United States Attorney

18 DATED: _____

/s/ _____
 SUSAN KNIGHT
 Assistant United States Attorney

20 DATED: _____

/s/ _____
 ANGELA HANSEN
 Assistant Federal Public Defender

23
 24 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time between January 9, 2006 and
 25 February 13, 2006 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act. The Court finds that the failure to
 26 grant the requested continuance would deny the defendant effective preparation of counsel. The
 27 Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the
 28 best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of

1 criminal cases. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under
2 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4
5 1/25/06
6 Dated _____

/S/ RONALD M. WHYTE
RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge